

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

General Electric Company v. leo so
Case No. D2025-5334

1. The Parties

The Complainant is General Electric Company, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Esin Avukatlık Ortaklığı, Türkiye.

The Respondent is leo so, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <generalelectricityetkilibayi.com> is registered with Cosmotown, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in relation to the disputed domain name and another domain name with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 19, 2025. On December 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name and the other domain name. On December 22, and December 23, 2025, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name and the other domain name which differed from the named Respondent and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 6, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant requested to suspend the proceedings and the proceedings were suspended on January 9, 2026. The proceeding was dismissed partially on February 18, 2026, in relation to the other domain name.

On January 6, 2026, the Center informed the parties in English and Turkish, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is English. On February 25, 2025, the Complainant filed an amended Complaint and confirmed its request that Turkish be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 29, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Gökhan Gökçe as the sole panelist in this matter on April 9, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a widely known and globally active technology, energy, and industrial company with its registered seat in the United States. The Complainant is the owner of the GENERAL ELECTRIC trademark, registered in numerous jurisdictions. The disputed domain name combines the Complainant’s mark with the Turkish expression “yetkili bayi” (“authorized dealer”), which indicates an apparent targeting of Turkish-speaking Internet users.

Among others, the Complainant owns the following trademark registrations:

- Turkish Trademark Registration No. 126156, registered on June 20, 1991, for GENERAL ELECTRIC, covering protection for a large number of products as protected in classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 21, 27, and 28;
- Turkish Trademark Registration No. 78954, registered on December 26, 1983, for GE, covering protection for a large number of products as protected in classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 17, 19, 20, 21.

The Complainant further operates various domain names comprising its GENERAL ELECTRIC trademark, such as <generalelectric.com> and <generalelectric.com.tr>, which are redirecting Internet users to its main company website at <ge.com>

The disputed domain name was registered on August 8, 2025.

According to the screenshots submitted with the Complaint, before the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to an active Turkish-language website displaying the Complainant’s GENERAL ELECTRIC and GE trademarks and referring to itself as “GENERAL ELECTRIC YETKİLİ BAYI”, “GENERAL ELECTRIC YETKİLİ SATIŞ VE SERVİS NOKTASI” and “GENERAL ELECTRIC YETKİLİ SATIŞ VE SERVİS MERKEZİ”. The website appears to have promoted sales and service activities in relation to GENERAL ELECTRIC-branded white goods and household appliances. The Panel visited the disputed domain name on April 14, 2026, and determined that it no longer resolves to an active website and instead leads to an error page.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

- The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.
- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.
- The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is English. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in Turkish. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be Turkish.

The Panel has considered the Complainant's arguments and notes that the website connected to the disputed domain name is Turkish suggesting that the Respondent has knowledge of Turkish. Having regard to paragraphs 10 and 11 of the Rules, section 4.5 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), and the need to ensure fairness while avoiding unnecessary delay and expense, the Panel determines that the proceeding shall be conducted, and this Decision rendered, in English, without requiring a translation of the Complaint.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "yetkili bayi" ("authorized dealer in English") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

In what concerns the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” in relation to the disputed domain name, such is viewed as a standard registration requirement, and is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of “proving a negative”, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

There is also no indication in the current record that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the Respondent has failed to demonstrate any of the other non-exclusive circumstances evidencing rights or legitimate interests under the Policy, paragraph 4(c) or other evidence of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent appears to be in no way associated with the Complainant, as the Complainant has not licensed, approved or in any way consented to the Respondent’s registration and use of the trademark in the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the Respondent’s failure to reply to the Complaint further supports the conclusion that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. See *The Argento Wine Company Limited v. Argento Beijing Trading Company*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0610](#); *Bayerische Motoren Werke AG v. (This Domain is For Sale) Joshuathan Investments, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0787](#).

The evidence submitted by the Complainant, including screenshots of the website to which the disputed domain name resolved, shows that the Respondent was offering maintenance and repair services relating to the Complainant’s products. The Panel also notes that the Respondent made unauthorized use of the Complainant’s trademark, stylized logo presentation, and corporate identity on the website associated with the disputed domain name. Furthermore, on the website linked to the disputed domain name, the Respondent represented itself as authorized and sought to reinforce this impression by using the expression “authorized service”, while at the same time providing no explanation whatsoever as to the nature of its commercial relationship, if any, with the Complainant. In accordance with the Policy, and as discussed in detail in *Okidata Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#), such use cannot be regarded as a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Moreover, the composition of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant's trademark GENERAL ELECTRIC with an additional term "yetkili bayi" in English "authorized dealer" could mislead Internet users into believing that the website at the disputed domain name may be operated by the Complainant regarding its repair and/or sale services, contrary to the fact.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant's rights in the GENERAL ELECTRIC trademark predate the registration date of the disputed domain name by years. In light of the above as well as of the well-known character of the GENERAL ELECTRIC trademark, and of the composition of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that it is not conceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's GENERAL ELECTRIC trademark, which supports a finding of bad faith registration. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

The Panel further notes that the composition of the disputed domain name and the nature of the associated website strongly indicate an intent to create a false association with the Complainant.

It appears that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name solely for the purpose of creating an association with the Complainant, in particular with its GENERAL ELECTRIC's related services. After having reviewed the Complainant's screenshots of the website linked to the disputed domain name, the Panel is convinced that the Respondent has intentionally registered the disputed domain name in order to generate traffic to its own website. The Panel notes that the Respondent has not published any visible disclaimer on the website linked to the disputed domain name to explain that there is no existing relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant. Quite the opposite, the design of the website linked to the disputed domain name and the prominent use of the Complainant's word and figurative GENERAL ELECTRIC trademark is sufficient evidence that the Respondent intentionally tries to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's GENERAL ELECTRIC trademark and the Complainant itself as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website.

In addition, the Panel accepts the failure of the Respondent to submit a response to the Complainant's contentions as an additional indication of bad faith.

The fact that the disputed domain name currently resolves to a blank website does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <generalelectricyetkilibayi.com> be transferred to the Complainant

/Gökhan Gökçe/

Gökhan Gökçe

Sole Panelist

Date: April 15, 2026